

The Press Editorials

● OPINIONS ● FEATURES ● COLUMNS

Hannah's Harpoons

BY HANNAH SAMPSON

When the children were littler I used to take them to a small park where they could run and play without hushing and without disturbing the neighbors in the apartment house in which we lived. They shouted and carried on with abandon while I sat and dreamed and dozed with one eye and one ear always looking and listening.



On one of these days an old gentleman came to join me on my bench and he too watched the children at their play.

"The beautiful exuberance of youth," he finally said conversationally.

"Youth can have it," I said, this having been a day of ups and downs and general not-getting-together between the children and me. "I'll take moderation."

The old gentleman chuckled. "Children can be pretty trying sometimes. But certainly interesting. To them everything is either terrible or wonderful. Nothing is 'just all right'."

"Moderation," I repeated stubbornly. "I'll take moderation in all things."

The old gentleman smiled. "Isn't that excessive?" he murmured.

And I had to laugh. Because of course one can get too much of a good thing. Without valleys, no mountains; or, as some character on radio used to say a long time ago: "You gotta take the bitter with the better."

The Art of Living

By RED LOCKWOOD

What to Learn?

The softness of the afternoon passed through the open window into the classroom.

The teacher talked. Several restless students stirred.

At the rear a young girl spoke almost aloud, words lost to all but she.

"Julie," the teacher asked. "What did you say?"

Her face flushed red, the girl stammered, "I... I was just thinking out loud, I guess."

"Yes, Julie," said the teacher gently. "And what were you thinking?"

She hesitated. "Well... well, I've been going to school most of my life. The longer I go the more I find there is to learn..."

Most Important

"Yes?" kindly prompted teacher.

"Well," she said, "I couldn't help wondering... you see, there's so much to know I wonder how I can ever contribute to life. It seems all there is to know is known."

"Ah," said the teacher, walking to her. "Julie, I understand. But, my dear, the most important of all knowledge still eludes the mind of men."

"What," asked Julie, "is that?"

"How," said the teacher, "to love our brother."

The Public's Voice

Why No Clamor Against A-Treaty?

To the Editor:

It is indeed surprising that there is not today a greater public clamor against the proposed test ban treaty which is already all but a reality. On one hand the silence may be further evidence of public apathy or a false sense of security; but, on the other, it may be indicative of the degree to which Americans have been accustomed to being the hopeless subjects of government.

The issue of the test ban treaty is an issue of American security—whether we are to remain secure so that we can preserve and lead the fight for freedom in the world. All right-thinking people want peace and the abolition of the implements of war; but not at any price, particularly not at the price of our own security.

The treaty is a difficult issue for an elected official to oppose because of the extreme emotion and natural tendencies for peace on the part of the voting public.

However, it is the kind of issue on which men of leadership will and should be separated from the pure politicians and many of us are waiting for that quality of leadership from both sides of the aisle. This is the time, in accordance with our history, for America to bring forth great leaders.

Let us look at the facts. There is little disagreement that the test curtails us in the areas where we are behind, yet fails to restrain the Russians where they are behind. Since there seems to be considerable evidence that we already have a satellite system which can detect testing in the atmosphere, what have we gained? Some twelve months ago while campaigning for Congress I quoted one of the advisers to our President to the effect that Russia would be suspicious and belligerent so long as we had military superiority over her.

His then incredible solution was to let her catch up and create a stalemate in order that we could negotiate under circumstances that would be productive. At this time, validity of this quotation was questioned, yet on

the surface the test ban treaty seems to be achieving the result of letting them catch up. When coupled with our removal of missile bases around the world, and cancellation of the many defense and attack projects by our Defense Secretary, the quotation appears now to have been an expression of the policy currently being pursued.

Perhaps under Utopian circumstances, this policy is intellectually and humanely correct. But, is it logically and strategically correct when the stakes are our way of life and the other side is the deceptive USSR which has broken 50 agreements out of some 52 it has signed; which even now emits poison into Latin America; which has under rein a stable of captive nations; which stands before the world as the architect of the Berlin Wall; and, with a gun at our very neck in Cuba forbids us to visit and see what is really there.

What person would entrust his property, no less his life, to such an adversary without first demanding some substantial and meaningful display of good faith?

Although perhaps lost in the headlines of the civil rights crisis at home, and tempered by the soothing words of promising peace, the test-ban treaty looms as a visit to the mount by this country.

We hear now that Mr. Kennedy has cut off air surveillance over Cuba so the treaty will not be upset and that he has relaxed security measures in other areas to relieve tension. Most certainly, the greatest motion for prompt approval of the treaty is the achievement of a political issue for 1964.

Will there not be one strong spokesman for the proposal that we will approve the treaty if Mr. Khrushchev lets us look even deeper into the caves of Cuba than we've been able to see from the air; if he lives up to his agreement in Laos; withdraws his dispensers of hate in South America; and if he lowers the Berlin Wall to let those behind it be free again.

Such a spokesman would, I am sure, find the public troops of America rallying behind his leadership. He

would also relieve many of us of the hopeless feeling that we seem destined to be the good guy and loser once more.

T. A. Bruinsma
Rolling Hills.

Property Rights

To the Editor:

The right of alienation of real property is a constitutional right which came to us early in our history from the Magna Charta and the common law. The theory is that one's home is his or her castle and the right to live in it or to sell it or refuse to sell it is protected by the first amendment of the Federal Constitution and most of the state constitutions, including California. The only person or corporation or entity constitutionally able to force a sale for public purposes is the state or any of its political subdivisions by paying reasonable compensation.

Under the homestead laws of this state a homestead is execution-proof up to \$12,500 for a married couple and \$500 for a single person. The same rule applies to the relation of landlord and tenant. If a landlord leases property to a tenant, the tenant has an estate in it which is also protected by law and forcible entry or detainer by the landlord subjects him to damages, even though the tenant is in default of rent, on the theory that his home is his castle.

He can only be evicted by the proper notice and an order of court for failure to vacate. No real estate agent, in the absence of a bona fide, written agreement to sell, can force the owner to sell his or her property to anyone regardless of race, color, religion or any other reason and an oral agreement to sell is not enforceable unless coupled with an interest or followed by possession. This applies wholly to real property; but the civil code of this state makes it a misdemeanor for the owner of any inn, hotel, motel or other amusement facility to refuse anyone regardless of color, race or religion service and the person who refuses can be sued civilly. This in my opinion is the solution of the present controversy and each and every city should have a property owner's protective association to pro-

Poetry and Children

Someone once said there is a little poetry in all of us. Certainly there is poetry in every phase of life. Often the poet is said to be child-like in his view of life. What is a better way to put it is that his view is more natural, more unspoiled, fresher than that of the more cynical or less poetic.

At any rate, children often try their hand at poetry. Much of it is naive, but it is fresh and unspoiled, and certainly natural. Two girls' efforts have come to our attention and we think they are worthy of printing here.

The first, "Rainstorm," is by a 13-year-old, Ida Marie Davis, of Silsbee, Tex., the great-niece of E. G. Davis, of 23720 Lucille Ave. The second, "Wondering," is by Nevada Voelker, 11, a sixth-grader at Sepulveda School.

RAINSTORM

Cloudy skies, growing darker
Thunder rolling in distant hills
Lightning leaves its first marker
Breeze leaves behind icy chills
Woodland creatures seek shelter
All but a few are safe home
Now a great rush, helter skelter
Seeking relief from rain's increasing drone
Hark! Do you hear?
The land is alive with sound
Sighs come faintly to your ear
As the plant life, their silent thirst drown
The animals too, are quenched

concerning two of your officers, Detectives Bell and Davis.

Frank I. Hogan

Praise for Police

To the Editor:

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I sent to Police Chief Percy Bennett last month.

Torrance's police department is a group of very efficient men and women who are doing fine work in the face of the city's continued growth and they are to be commended.

DON WOLF, Pres.
Anchor Mortgage

Chief of Police
Percy Bennett
3131 Torrance Blvd.
Torrance, California
Dear Sir:

"It is my pleasure to write a letter of commendation

ing their thirst
And the wind and the rain
are racing to see
Who can "kiss" them first
And all the animals that can
be seen
Are walking on earth washed
fresh and clean.

WONDERING

I've wondered oh? so many times,
And have always tried to see,
How things were once, and why they are,
And how they came to be.
I've wondered how the stars can stay,
High up in the night,
And the sun can give off
Its beautiful, radiant light.
I've wondered how the flowers grow,
And the trees so tall, and green,
And I've wondered why the clouds are white,
And why the air cannot be seen.
I've wondered how the rain comes down,
And the wind does blow.
I've wondered why it hails and sleets,
And why we sometimes have snow.
I've wondered how birds can fly,
And every ghost says "boo!"
And how we all can whistle,
And why the Red Sea is blue.
There's so many wonders,
It's hard to keep count,
For they come right after another,
And when I think about these things,
It really makes me wonder.

concerning two of your officers, Detectives Bell and Davis.

"Recently my office was burglarized of office machinery; your department not only recovered the equipment quickly; but the help and courtesy extended by them and the others who worked with them was greatly appreciated. Please convey to them my sincere thanks.
"Very truly yours,
DON WOLF, Pres.
Anchor Mortgage"

Idea for Today

The idea of freedom is infectious. Once it catches in the minds of men, it spreads. Let's "infect" the minds of those who oppose us with freedom.

Not Easy to Be the Right Kind of Patriot Today

(Continued from Page A1)
idea and the reality... falls the shadow, and we are determined to chase away that shadow in the uncompromising light of truth."

But ARE WE? It is at this point that our patriotism, our love of country, has to be a discriminating, not a blind force. All too often, voices are raised, in the name of some superpatriotism, to still all criticism and to denounce honest divergences as the next thing to treason. We have risen up from the pit of McCarthy's time, when honest men could lose their jobs for questioning whether there were 381 known Communists in the State Department. But the intolerant spirit which equates responsible criticisms with "selling the country short" or "being soft on communism" or "undermining the American way of life" is still abroad.

I can give you no comfort in suggesting there is an easy way around this type of criticism. Our position today is equivocal. We ARE in one sense a very conservative people—for no nation in history has had so much to conserve. Suggestions that everything is not perfect and that things must be changed DO arouse the suspicion that something I cherish and I value may be modified. Even Aristotle complained that "everyone thinks chiefly of his own, hardly ever of the public interest." And our instinct is to preserve what we have, and then to give the instinct a colored wrapping of patriotism.

This is in part of what the great Dr. Johnson meant when he said: "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." To defend every abuse, every self-interest, every encrusted position of privilege in the name of love of country—when in fact it is only love of the status quo—that indeed is the lie in the soul to which any conservative society is prone.

Edge of Hypocrisy
We do not escape it—but

with us, an extra edge of hypocrisy attaches to the confusion. For our basic reason for being a state is our attempt to build a dynamic and equal society for free men. Societies based on blood ties can perhaps safely confuse conservatism and patriotism. People with long backward-looking traditions can perhaps do so. Countries under the heel of dictators must do so. But if the world's first experiment in the open society uses patriotism as a cloak for inaction, then it will cease to be open—and then, as a social organization, it will lose its fundamental reason for existence.

Do not, therefore, regard the critics as questionable patriots. What were Washington and Jefferson and Adams but profound critics of the colonial status quo? Our society can stand a large dose of constructive criticism just because it is so solid and has so much to conserve. It is only if keen and lively minds constantly compare the ideal and the reality and see the shadow—the shadow of self-righteousness, of a suburban sprawl, of racial discrimination, of interminable strikes—it is only then that the shadow can be dispelled and the unique brightness of our national experiment can be seen and loved.

The patriots are those who love America enough to wish to see her as a model of mankind. This is not treachery. This—as every parent, every teacher, every friend must know—is the truest and noblest affection. No patriots so defaced America as those who, in the name of Americanism, launched a witch-hunt that became a byword around the world. We have survived it. We shall survive John Birchism and all the rest of the super-patriots—but only at the price of perpetual and truly patriotic vigilance.

This discriminating and vigilant patriotism is all the more necessary because the world at large is one in

which a simple, direct, inward-looking nationalism is not enough.

We face in Communist hostility and expansionism a formidable force, whether Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Mao Tse-tung pull together or apart. They disagree so far only on whether capitalism should be peacefully or violently buried. They are both for the funeral. So long as this fundamental objective remains, we must regard the Communist Bloc as a whole with extreme wariness.

Even if the Communists are divided and confused everywhere—even if they have scored of late none of the victories in Africa, East Asia, and the Middle East our doomsayers predicted—still the Communist Bloc is aggressive and powerful and determined to grow more so. Taken individually, the European states are all outnumbered. Even America has only a margin of superiority over the tough, austere Soviet Union. Even if the Russian forces in Cuba are not going to conquer the Americas, still their presence in this hemisphere endangers the peace.

So we have sensibly concluded in the NATO Alliance that our separate sovereignties and nationalisms must be transcended in a common, overwhelming union of deterrent strength. Together our weight keeps the balance of power firmly down on our side, and it removes from each state the temptation of playing off one state against another and weakening the overall power in order to strengthen its own. This is the first reason for transcending narrow nationalism.

The second follows from our economic interdependence. The Atlantic world has taken 70 per cent of the world trade and absorbed 70 per cent of its own investments in the last seventy years. We are an interwoven international economy. Bank rates in Britain affect investments in New York. Restrictions here af-

fect carpet makers in Belgium. French farmers affect everybody. We can only avoid the mismanagement of this community if we pursue joint policies. My friend Jean Monnet has outlined the essential list: expansion of demand, currency stability, investment overseas, trade with the developing nations, reserves for world trade. Without joint policies here, we could easily slip back to the debacle of the period between the great civil wars of Europe of 1914 and 1939.

True Patriotism

In this context, separate divisive nationalism is not patriotism. It cannot be patriotism to enlarge a country's illusory sense of potency and influence, and reduce its security and economic viability. True patriotism demands that, in some essential categories, purely national solutions be left behind in the interest of the nation itself. It is this effort to transcend narrow nationalism that marked the supremely successful Marshall Plan. It marks the great enterprise of European unification—after so many tribal wars. It could mark the building of an Atlantic partnership as a secure nucleus of world order.

So our vision must be of the open society fulfilling itself in an open world. This we can love. This gives our country its universal validity. This is a patriotism which sets no limits to the capacity of our country to act as the organizing principle of wider and wider associations, until in some way not yet foreseen, we can embrace the family of man.

And here our patriotism encounters its last ambiguity. There are misguided patriots who feel we pay too much attention to other nations, that we are somehow enfeebled by respecting world opinion. Well, "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind" was the very first order of business when the Republic was created; the Declaration of Independ-

dence was written, not to proclaim our separation, but to explain it and win other nations to our cause. The founding fathers did not think it was "soft" or "un-American" to respect the opinions of others, and today for a man to love his country truly, he must also know how to love mankind. The change springs from many causes. The two appalling wars of this century, culminating in the atom bomb, have taught all men the impossibility of war. Horace may have said: "It is sweet and fitting to die for one's country." But to be snuffed out in the one brief blast of an atomic explosion bears on relation to the courage and clarity of the old limited ideal.

Nor is this a simple shrinking from annihilation. It is something much deeper—a growing sense of our solidarity as a human spe-

cies on a planet made one and vulnerable by our science and technology.

For on this shrunken globe, men can no longer live as strangers. Men can war against each other as hostile neighbors, as we are determined not to do; or they can coexist in frigid isolation, as we are doing. But our prayer is that men everywhere will learn, finally, to live as brothers, to respect each other's differences, to heal each other's wounds, to promote each other's progress, and to benefit from each other's knowledge. If the evangelical virtue of charity can be translated into political terms, aren't these our goals?

Good of Man

Aristotle said that the end of politics must be the good of man. Man's greatest good and greatest present need is, then, to establish world peace. Without it, the dem-

ocratic enterprise—one might say the human enterprise—will be utterly, fatally doomed. War under modern conditions is bereft of even that dubious logic it may have had in the past. With the development of modern technology, "victory" in war has become a mockery. What victory—victory for what or for whom?

Perhaps younger people are especially sensitive to this growing conviction that nowadays all wars are civil wars and all killing is fratricide. The movement takes many forms—multilateral diplomacy through the United Nations, the search for world peace through world law, the universal desire for nuclear disarmament, the sense of sacrifice and service of the Peace Corps, the growing revulsion against Jim Crowism, the belief that dignity rests in man as such and that all must be treated as ends, not means.

But whatever its form, I believe that, far from being in any sense an enemy to patriotism, it is a new expression of the respect for life from which all true love springs. We can truly begin to perceive the meaning of our great propositions—of liberty and equality—if we see them as part of the patrimony of all men. We shall not love our corner of the planet less for loving the planet, too, and resisting with all our skill and passion the dangers that would reduce it to smoldering ashes.

I can, therefore, wish no more for the profound patriotism of Americans than that they add to it a new dedication to the world-wide brotherhood of which they are a part and that, together with their love of America, there will grow a wider love which seeks to transform our earthly city, with all its races and peoples, all of its creeds and aspirations, into Saint Augustine's "Heavenly city where truth reigns, love is the law, and whose extent is eternity."

LIFE IN THE ROAR by KANE



...AND THE MISSUS SAYS SHE'S CALLING THE BABY NUMBER 77654 JR., AFTER ME!